

sponsored by the Honolulu Veterans of Foreign Wars. I certainly give my personal congratulations to Ms. Monroy, the daughter of Daniel and Loretta Monroy. I also would like to express my appreciation to VFW Post 1540 of Honolulu and its Ladies' Auxiliary for sponsoring the event. I trust that it will provide inspiration to my colleagues as we deliberate and endeavor to legislate solutions to the issues our Nation faces.

DEMOCRACY—ABOVE AND BEYOND—1996-97
VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP
PROGRAM

(By Hawaii Winner Tiffany Monroy)

A mother had three children: Adam, Owen, and Daniel. Upon dying, the mother gave Adam to his banished father to be raised. Owen was given to his aunts and uncles to be raised. Finally, Daniel was given to the community to be raised by all. Years went by and the boys grew up. Adam became a rotund man who ate all he wanted when he wanted and no one could stop him from doing what he wanted. Owen grew up into a portly fellow who shared whatever he wanted with an esoteric group of friends. Daniel developed into a toned, lean, tall man, because he ate and worked depending upon the prosperity and needs of the community. It was he who soared above and beyond his brothers. These men soon became leaders of nations, taking with them the only governing methods they knew. When these individuals died, their governments lived on. Adam became autocracy, Owen became oligarchy, and Daniel became democracy. Like Daniel, who towered over his siblings, democracy remains above and beyond autocracy and oligarchy.

The three forms of government are like ladders competing to reach a great land—a land of great milk, great honey, and great chocolate—which coincidentally is at a great height. The amount of rungs a climbing individual has is in direct proportion to how many people have the power and authority to rule. "Contestant #1, with the ruling power in the hand of one sole individual, is Autocracy. Contestant #2, with the ruling power in the hands of a few people, is Oligarchy. Finally, last but not least, contestant #3, with the ruling power in the hands of many people is Democracy. Okay, contestants, on your mark get set, go! Wow, I don't know how Autocracy is going to get to the top with only one rung and I can't see how Oligarchy's gonna make it up . . . But hark! Look at Democracy go! He's got enough rungs to get him to the top and then some! Go Democracy go! And the winner without any competition is Democracy! Just look at him standing at the zenith sparkling with sweat, way up above and beyond the other two!"

Democracy is able to maintain itself above and beyond any other form of government because of the level of participation democracy calls for from those who are governed. It calls on everyone to participate in their government since democracy is the form of government in which rule is by the people. As Pericles of Athens said, "Our constitution is named a democracy because it is in the hands not the few, but of the many." In a democracy people cannot sit back with their arms folded and leave decisions up to a sole person. Instead, they must unfold their arms, stand up, and take action for what they believe in. Democracy gives people the opportunity to be active participants in the government which rules them. Perhaps even better, democracy makes those who are governed care about their government. Because the power is in the hands of the people, it is the people themselves who must take responsibility for what happens to them, since it is

ultimately their choice. Therefore, they care about their government even more than those people who are ruled by autocracies or oligarchies. The caring, active participation that democracy calls for is what keeps democracy high above and above any other form of government.

Democracy remains untouched by any other form of government because there essentially no one ruling over the people. The marrow of democracy, the very core of this type of government is the fact that the people rules themselves. There is no almighty leader who says "this is the way things go" nor is there an omnipotent group who dictates "this is how all things shall be done." Rather, in a democracy, the people choose for themselves who they want and what they want and need. Perhaps Abraham Lincoln captured the quintessence of democracy by saying democracy is a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." This is exactly what puts democracy above and beyond any other government: the people have the ultimate say.

Through every age democracy has and always will remain above and beyond any other form of government because it calls for caring participation from the people by putting the power directly into the hands of the people. Democracy will forever stay above and beyond any other form of government because no one else has a ladder with as many rungs.

IN HONOR OF MARGIE WAGONER
OF HOUSTON

HON. KEN BENTSEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1997

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Margie Wagoner, a teacher at Corpus Christi Catholic School in my district, who this Thursday will be awarded a \$2,500 grant by the Children's Television Workshop and Creative Classroom magazine to implement an innovative school project. Her creative and innovative teaching methods bring education to life for her students, and her outstanding efforts have now been nationally recognized.

Ms. Wagoner is one of only three teachers chosen to receive a grant in the second annual "Plan a Dream" program. She will use her grant to establish a "global garden" to give her students a better understanding of the world in which they live. Sixth grade students will research, plan, and build a greenhouse to support the global garden. Second graders will explore and grow plants from different areas of the world focusing on their ancestors' country of origin. Students will learn about the different plants in the garden, as well as the customs and folklore of the nations from which they originate.

Parents will recognize the Children's Television Workshop as the men and women who make educational shows such as "Sesame Street" and the "Electric Company" possible. But they also work with educators to help them improve both the way we teach our children and the environment in which we teach them. The "Plan a Dream" program recognizes the efforts of teachers like Margie Wagoner and tries to build on their success.

Open to all teachers of kindergarten through sixth grades, ideas were submitted in the areas of technology, math, science, language arts, social studies, and the arts. Projects

were judged by an expert panel on originality of the idea, explanation of education value, effective classroom planning, exemplary use of materials, ability to motivate students, and innovative lesson presentation.

I salute Margie Wagoner for her accomplishments and her commitment to teaching. She is an outstanding role model for her students, parents, and other teachers. Her national recognition is well-deserved.

REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1997

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, September 17, 1997 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY

A Hoosier friend asked me the other day what's the most important thing to do to restore the confidence of people in the federal government. My response was that we have to make government accessible, responsive, and workable.

The critics of government certainly have a point. Government can be inefficient, inaccessible, and unaccountable. It is not hard to understand why government, especially the federal government, is under attack. But it has always seemed to me that the best answer to the critics of government is to make government work better.

COMPLICATED COUNTRY

Under our system of government we have a representative democracy—a government in which decisions are made by the people through their elected representatives. It is far from a perfect system. It can be difficult to understand, chaotic, slow, and frustrating. But I believe it is the best way for us to deal with our nation's challenges and problems.

We live in a complicated country of vast size and remarkable diversity. Since World War II the population of our country has more than doubled. Our citizens are spread far and wide, and they represent a great variety of races, religions, regional interests, and national origins. It is not easy to develop a system to enable such a country to live together peacefully and productively, but representative democracy allows us to do it. Representative democracy, for all its faults, is our best hope for dealing with our problems through a process of compromise, negotiation, and deliberation. Our system gives people an opportunity not only to speak but also to participate in the decision-making process and to engage with others in open discussion and debate. At its best, representative democracy gives us a system whereby all of us have a voice in the process and a stake in the product.

Many people think that the way to deal with their problems is to abolish politics. But politics—the process of compromise, negotiation, and deliberation—is the essence of how we make our system work. Politics may be unpopular but it is also indispensable. It is the way that we express the popular will of the people. We need to strengthen representative democracy, not enfeeble it.

ROLE FOR GOVERNMENT

In many ways we have lost what was the premise of government in this country when it was formed—the belief that government can work. The widespread public contempt

for government today produces a vicious circle that makes government worse.

I am well aware of the problems we have today in government, but I am also impressed with the miracle of our constitutional structure. It is a commonplace observation to praise the wisdom of the founding fathers, but it is also necessary for us to continually appreciate the remarkable system they put together. The representative democracy envisioned by our Constitution is strong enough to preserve the fragile union, strong enough to promote the general welfare, and strong enough to ward off the power of the special interests.

I do not want to see a federal government that is crippled or incapable of playing a significant role in the life of this country. Government should be able to provide for the national security, help address social problems, protect the environment, and to do the many other things we have come to expect it to do. Sometimes government gets in our way, but other times it can be helpful to ordinary people in their effort to succeed, to have opportunity, and to correct instances of oppression and injustice.

CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

Our country has seen major changes in recent years—the globalization of our economy, the federal deficit constraining government's ability to deal with problems, the end of the Cold War and the less coherent framework for international relations, and the shift of many Americans toward individual freedom and consumption and away from restraint and sense of duty. All of this change has brought formidable challenges to policymakers, and government has not always performed well. Confidence in government has declined.

Government has lost so much respect in recent years that it threatens the ability to make good policy. If we are to have effective government and effective public policy then we must improve the confidence of the people in government. Several steps would be helpful. I believe we need more of what the politicians call "retail politics"—direct contact between the elected representative and the people. Today too much of our politics is based on the work of consulting firms, pollsters, and media advisors, and voters have difficulty feeling real ties to the people they elect to govern them. We will strengthen the confidence of the people in government if we can engage them more in the process. Elected officials can also help restore confidence in government by promising less and producing more, focussing better on what the citizens want, working together across party and ideological lines for shared goals, and restoring greater civility to the political debate.

But perhaps the most important step is to improve public understanding of what government has done and can do. Those of us who see important reasons for government to act must be willing not just to criticize government and point out its faults, but also to make clear what government has been able to accomplish—from preserving our security and building the interstate highway system to setting up the national parks and sharply reducing poverty among older persons through Social Security. It is important that all of us have an understanding of the limits of government but also an understanding that government works well in many areas. I simply do not see how it is possible to deal with many of our problems without a minimal public confidence in government.

CONCLUSION

I know there are a lot of voices today saying that representative democracy in this country just doesn't work very well. And it's certainly not difficult to point to instances

when it does not. But on the other hand, given the number and complexity of the problems we confront, my view is that our representative democracy works reasonably well. I do not for a moment agree with those who think that the American system has failed or that the future of the country is bleak.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1997

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 398 and 399. I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on both accounts.

UPDATE ON MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 17, 1997

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, over the last several years, the United States has led an effort in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD] to develop a binding and comprehensive agreement on investment. In May 1995, the OECD Ministers launched the negotiation of a Multilateral Agreement on Investment [MAI]. At the OECD ministerial meeting in May 1997, the OECD Ministers agreed to extend the negotiations until May 1998. Negotiating sessions are scheduled every 6 weeks beginning the week of September 15.

Recently, Dr. Witherell, Director of Financial Fiscal and Enterprise Affairs of the OECD gave a speech entitled "The Multilateral Agreement Investment (MAI) Negotiations: The State of Play and Implications for the Asia Pacific Region." Issues involved in the agreement are complex and time consuming. Dr. Witherell's speech presented a clear and objective analysis of the issues.

I suggest that interested Members review extracts from Dr. Witherell's speech. His speech presented the issues of the MAI and discussed which issues need to be resolved in order to conclude a successful MAI.

I request that a copy of extracts from Dr. Witherell's speech dated September 1, 1997, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXTRACTS FROM MAI SPEECH BY WILLIAM WITHERELL, SYDNEY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1997

One of the central objectives of the OECD since its creation in 1961 has been the development of a liberal environment for international investment. A very important step was taken at the OECD Ministerial meeting of May '95 when the governments of the 29 OECD Member countries' decided to commence negotiations on a Multilateral Agreement on Investment (the MAI). The private business sector was a strong advocate for developing a comprehensive legal framework for foreign direct investment which would consolidate and extend the present system of bilateral, regional and sectoral agreements. While the negotiations are between the OECD Member countries and the European Commission, the resulting agreement is to

be a free standing treaty, open to any country willing and able to assume the obligations of the agreement.*

The OECD Ministers initially targeted the completion of the negotiations for May of this year; but that proved to be too optimistic despite the strong commitment and political will of our Member countries and a very intensive schedule. The issues are complex and time-consuming; and some, especially those of a more "political nature," might not be resolved until the liberalization commitments among the participating countries are fully agreed. So a modest extension of the timetable until next April has been set. This extra time will ensure that the result is indeed a high standard agreement with a satisfactory balance of commitments by all parties. Extra time also has opened up the possibility for non-OECD countries to be involved more closely. Indeed, some may even become founding members of the Agreement.

We now have—in almost final form—the main building blocks of this Agreement. Of course, there remain a number of outstanding issues—the inclusion of a special clause for regional economic integration agreements such as the EU, the coverage of sub-national measures, the treatment of cultural measures, the issue of conflicting jurisdiction and the treatment of labor and environment matters, to name some. Some, especially the more politically sensitive ones, are likely to remain unsettled until the last minute. This is to be expected in such a negotiation. But the ground has been prepared for a successful outcome in the coming months. A satisfactory agreement for all concerned—including interested non-OECD countries—is clearly within our reach.

WHAT WILL THE MAI LOOK LIKE?

The MAI will be the first multilateral agreement to include disciplines in three key areas of investment rule-making: investment protection, investment liberalization and binding dispute settlement. As such, it is undoubtedly the most complex multilateral negotiation on investment ever undertaken.

The MAI aims to provide a "level playing field" for international investors by eliminating distortions to investment flows and facilitating a more efficient allocation of capital. This will contribute to the ultimate objectives of economic growth and development. In the MAI contracting parties will undertake obligations aimed at reducing barriers and discriminatory treatment of FDI (investment liberalization) and increasing legal security for international investment and investors (investment protection). These obligations will be legally enforceable through provisions for settling disputes—including investor-to-state as well as state-to-state disputes. In all of these areas, the negotiators are seeking to incorporate high standards.

The MAI will bind the Contracting Parties to a set of fundamental rules governing the treatment of MAI investors and investments. The non-discrimination principles of National Treatment and most-favored nation treatment (MFN) will be the norms for all phases of investment from the entry of the investor and its investments to the treatment of the investor and its investments after they are established. These central principles will assure foreign investors non-discriminatory access to a sector and equitable treatment after they are established.

Some who are not familiar with the negotiations have misunderstood these provisions as requiring a wholesale dismantling of governmental regulations. The clearly is not the case. The MAI will not deprive national authorities of their sovereign right to promote

*Footnotes appear at end of speech.